



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,262	07/25/2003	Hakan P.O. Larsson	03370-P0047A	7595

24126 7590 03/04/2005

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC  
986 BEDFORD STREET  
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619

EXAMINER
----------

WILLIAMS, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,262

Applicant(s)

LARSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Williams

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 18, 2005 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,635,761 to Smith et al.

Re-claim 1, Smith et al. disclose a modular disc brake, comprising: a service brake mechanism 36 (brake 36 is capable of acting as a service brake) and modules in the form of a frame 12 having a recess, a cover 60, and a house 30 for the service brake, a part of the house is positioned between and outside the frame and the cover, and received in the frame (see figure), and mounted to be substantially unloaded during braking, see column 3 lines 18-24.

Re-claim 2, a lower part of the house is received in the recess.

Re-claim 4, the brake mechanism is a single pre-mounted unit received in the house.

Re-claim 11, the house receives a lever 70 of the brake mechanism.

Art Unit: 3683

Re-claim 13, Smith et al. disclose a modular disc brake, comprising: a service brake mechanism 36 (brake 36 is capable of acting as a service brake) and modules in the form of a frame 12, a cover 60, and a house 30, a part of the house is positioned between and outside the frame and the cover and is mounted to be substantially unloaded during braking, see column 3 lines 18-24.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 3, 5-10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al.

Re-claim 3, Smith et al. fail to specifically teach the house being made from a plastic. The use of plastic in place of metal is known in the art as a way of reducing costs and weight. It

Art Unit: 3683

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have manufactured the house of Smith et al. from a plastic material, thus reducing manufacturing costs as well as weight.

Re-claim 5, the brake is pre-mounted in the house 30.

Re-claim 6, the cover 60 covers and open end of the house, see figure 2.

Re-claim 7, the house is open in one direction to receive the brake, and is open in another direction to receive the thrust unit, and has a space for the lever 70.

Re-claim 8, the frame 12 has openings for receiving a plurality of pull rods 50, each pull rod is clamped the frame 12 and the cover 60, the pull rods have heads at one end 52 and are threaded at another end. However, Smith et al. fail to teach the use of nuts for holding the pull rods in place, but rather have the pull rods threaded to the frame. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have simply passed the pull rods through the frame of Smith et al. then having used nuts when securing the pull rods in place, this would have reduced costs by eliminating the need for providing threaded holes in the frame and using off the shelf items, such as nuts to secure the bolts (or pull rods) in place.

Re-claims 9 and 16, Smith et al. teach a gasket between the house and the cover, see gasket located in element 48. This is interpreted as being between the house and the cover, when viewing the house as an elongated member.

Re-claims 10 and 17, the house is pre-tensioned by the pull rods.

Re-claim 12, Smith et al. fail to teach the pull rods not passing through the house. It would have been an obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a matter of design choice to have simply placed the pull rods of Smith et al. outside the house, such as by shrinking the size of the house to fit between the pull rods thus reducing weight, and since applicant fails to

Art Unit: 3683

disclose that having the pull rods outside the house solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that having the pull rods of Smith et al. outside the house would have performed equally well. It is noted that Smith et al. specifically teaches that the pull rods are not threaded to the house, thus interaction between the pull rods and house is not necessary.

Re-claim 14, Smith et al. disclose a modular disc brake, comprising: a brake mechanism 36 and modules in the form of a frame 12, a cover 60, and a house 30, a number of pull rods 50, the frame has a recess for receiving the house and the pull rods clamp between the frame and the cover, the house is pre-tensioned by the pull rods. However, Smith et al. fail to teach the pull rods not passing through the house.

It would have been an obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a matter of design choice to have simply placed the pull rods of Smith et al. outside the house, such as by shrinking the size of the house to fit between the pull rods thus reducing weight, and since applicant fails to disclose that having the pull rods outside the house solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that having the pull rods of Smith et al. outside the house would have performed equally well. It is noted that Smith et al. specifically teaches that the pull rods are not threaded to the house, thus interaction between the pull rods and house is not necessary.

Re-claim 15, Smith et al. teach a modular disc brake, comprising: a service brake mechanism 36 (brake 36 is capable of acting as a service brake) and modules in the form of a frame 12 with a recess, a cover 60, and a house 30, a part of the house is positioned between and outside the frame and the cover and is mounted to be substantially unloaded during braking, see column 3 lines 18-24, a lower part of the house is received in the recess; the brake is a single pre-mounted unit received in the house; the cover covers and open end of the house; the house has a

Art Unit: 3683

second open end for receiving a thrust unit, and has a space for a lever 70 of the brake; the frame and cover have openings for a plurality of pull rods.

However, Smith et al. fail to specifically teach the house being made from a plastic. The use of plastic in place of metal is known in the art as a way of reducing costs and weight. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have manufactured the house of Smith et al. from a plastic material, thus reducing manufacturing costs as well as weight.

In addition, Smith et al. fail to teach the use of nuts for holding the pull rods in place, but rather have the pull rods threaded to the frame. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have simply passed the pull rods through the frame of Smith et al. then having used nuts when securing the pull rods in place, this would have reduced costs by eliminating the need for providing threaded holes in the frame and using off the shelf items, such as nuts to secure the bolts (or pull rods) in place.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Williams whose telephone number is (703) 305-1346 (after April 2005 the new telephone number will be 571-272-7128). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 3683

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Bucci, can be reached at (703) 308-3668 (after April 11, 2005 the new telephone number will be 571-272-7099). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

TJW

March 3, 2005

THOMAS WILLIAMS  
PATENT EXAMINER

Thomas Williams  
AU 3683  
3-03-05